



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/072,399	02	2/05/2002	Ramkartik Mulukutla	020431.1021	4786
5073	7590	07/14/2004		EXAMINER	
BAKER BO		.P.	ALI, MOHAMMAD		
2001 ROSS SUITE 600	AVENUE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980				2177	
				DATE MAILED: 07/14/200-	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		\sim					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/072,399	MULUKUTLA ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Mohammad Ali	2177					
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address					
Period for Reply	VIO OET TO EVOIDE AN	IONITU(C) EDOM					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a ly within the statutory minimum of thin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON en cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 F</u>	ebruary 2002.						
,— · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application	Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct							
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attache	d Office Action of form F10-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Apprity documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)					
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	es [] station at	(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) ·					

Art Unit: 2177

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is in response to the Application filed on February 05, 2004.
 The application has been examined. Claims 1-35 are pending in this Office

Action.

Specification

2. The use of the trademark SMALLTALKTM, JAVATM etc in page 2 and subsequent pages have been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Art Unit: 2177

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murali M. Krishna ('Krishna' hereinafter), USP 5,412,804 in view of Simon Guy Williams ('Williams' hereinafter), USP 6,735,593.

With respect to claim 1,

Krishna discloses a method for retrieving hierarchical data from relational database (see col. 4, lines 46-47, Figs. 1-3), comprising the steps of:

creating a query retrieving said hierarchical data, said query including at least one join term (see col. 3, lines 30-39, Krishna);

selecting, for said query, driving table from plurality of database tables including said hierarchical data (see col. 4, lines 55-59, Fig. 2, Krishna); and

imposing, for said query, at least one restriction at least one table said plurality of database tables including said hierarchical data (see col. 6, lines 65 to col. 7, lines 2, Fig. 2, Krishna).

Krishna does not explicitly indicate the claimed hierarchical data.

Williams discloses claimed hierarchical data (the record is an explicit feature of the hierarchical and network data models and closely corresponds to the tuple in the relational model, see col. 41, lines 46-48, Williams).

Art Unit: 2177

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because hierarchical data of Williams teaching would have allowed Krishna's system to provides plurality of items wherein each item representing an entity or verb and creating a plurality of links and each link representing an association defined by a verb and at least two entities as suggested by Williams at col. 3, lines 45-48.

As to claim 2,

Krishna teaches replicating frequently searched entities into said driving table (see col. 6, lines 65 to col. 7, lines 2, Fig. 2, et seq, Krishna).

As to claim 3,

Krishna teaches performing partial denormalization by replicating frequently searched information into said driving table (see col. 6, lines 19-25 et seq, Krishna).

As to claim 4,

Krishna teaches creating surrogate column on said driving table, said surrogate id column storing a sequence of increasing integer values as records are inserted into said driving table (see col. 5, lines 8-10 et seq, Krishna).

As to claim 5,

Krishna teaches sending said query to said relational database (see col. 5, lines 45-47, Figs. 1-3).

As to claim 6,

Art Unit: 2177

Krishna teaches creating a fetch instruction for said query, said fetch instruction including number of rows of said hierarchical data be retrieved (see col. 5, lines 46-50, Figs. 1-3).

As to claim 7,

Krishna teaches creating a fetch instruction for said query, said fetch instruction causing ordering performed before row numbers are assigned (see col. 5, lines 63-67, Figs. 1-3).

As to claim 8,

Krishna teaches creating a Cursor (see col. 4, lines 46-47, Figs. 1-3);

sending said Cursor URL forming said query based on said Cursor URL (see col. 6, lines 30-35, Fig. 1); and

sending said query to said relational database (see col. 4, lines 46-47, Figs. 1-3). Krishna does not explicitly indicate the claimed URL.

Williams discloses claimed URL see col. 21, lines 66-67, Williams).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because URL of Williams teaching would have allowed Krishna's system to provides plurality of items wherein each item representing an entity or verb and creating a plurality of links and each link representing an association defined by a verb and at least two entities as suggested by Williams at col. 3, lines 45-48.

As to claim 9,

Art Unit: 2177

Krishna teaches sending said query to said relational database, said query including said at least one join term and said at least one restriction imposed on said at least one table of said plurality of database tables including said hierarchical data (see col. 6, lines 65 to col. 7, lines 2, Fig. 2, Krishna).

As to claim 10,

Krishna teaches wherein said at least one table of said plurality of database tables including said hierarchical data comprises said driving table.

As to claim 11,

Krishna teaches creating an address field, said address field including Surrogate Cursor Id, maximum or minimum value ordering said retrieving by column, and a name of a column associated with said ordering (see col. 8, lines 40-45 et seq, Fig. 1);

sending said address field to a server, said server forming said query based on a Cursor URL (see col. 4, lines 46-47, Figs. 1-3, Krishna); and

sending said query to said relational database (see col. 4, lines 46-47, Figs. 1-3). Krishna does not explicitly indicate the claimed URL.

Williams discloses claimed URL see col. 21, lines 66-67, Williams).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because URL of Williams teaching would have allowed Krishna's system to provides plurality of items wherein each item representing an entity or verb and creating a plurality of links and each link representing an association defined by a verb and at least two entities as suggested by Williams at col. 3, lines 45-48.

Art Unit: 2177

As to claim 12,

Krishna teaches wherein said relational database comprises a DB2 database system (see col. 4, lines 46-47, Figs. 1-3, Krishna).

As to claim 13,

Krishna teaches wherein said relational database comprises an Oracle database system (see col. 4, lines 46-47, Figs. 1-3).

As to claim 14,

Krishna teaches wherein said query comprises a query formatted in SQL (see col. 8, lines 60-67, Krishna).

Claim 15 has same subject matter as of claim 1 except a data base and a user interface, said user interface coupled to said database and operable to and Krishna teaches at see col. 4, lines 46-47, Figs. 2 and 19 and essentially rejected for the same reasons as discussed above.

Krishna does not explicitly indicate the claimed hierarchical data.

Williams discloses claimed hierarchical data (the record is an explicit feature of the hierarchical and network data models and closely corresponds to the tuple in the relational model, see col. 41, lines 46-48, Williams).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because hierarchical data of Williams teaching would have allowed Krishna's system to provides plurality of items wherein each item representing an entity or verb and creating a

Art Unit: 2177

plurality of links and each link representing an association defined by a verb and at least two entities as suggested by Williams at col. 3, lines 45-48.

Claims 16-25 have same subject matter as of claims 5, 6, and 8-14 respectively and essentially rejected for the same reasons as discussed above.

Claims 26-20 have subject matter as of claims 1, 5, 6, 8, and 9 respectively and essentially rejected for the same reasons as discussed above.

Claims 31-35 have subject matter as of claims 1, 5, 6, 8, and 9 respectively and essentially rejected for the same reasons as discussed above.

Art Unit: 2177

Contact Information

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad Ali whose telephone number is (703) 605-4356. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790 or Customer Service (703) 306-5631. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306 for any communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Mohammad Ali

Patent Examiner

AU 2177

MA

July 11, 2004